

CONTINUATION
OF THE
M I T R E
AND THE
C R O W N;
OR,
A Real Distinction
BETWEEN THEM.

In a Second LETTER to a Reverend
Member of the CONVOCATION.

By the Author of the First LETTER.

L O N D O N:

Printed for HENRY CLEMENTS, at the *Half Moon*,
in St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1712.

CONTINUATION

M. I. T. R. E.

AND THE
C. R. O. W. N.

A Real Distinction

BETWEEN THEM



in a second LETTER to a Reverend
Member of the CONVOCAATION.

By the Author of the FIRST LETTER.

LONDON

Printed for Henry Clements, at the Half Moon
in St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1712.

CONTINUATION
OF THE

MITRE and the CROWN.

REVEREND SIR,

I Have in my *first Letter*, as plainly and briefly as I could, stated the Question about the Subjects of the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; or the Persons on whom our blessed Saviour bestow'd that purely spiritual Power, juridically to remit or retain Sins, authoritatively to dispense the Word, Sacraments and Censures of the Church. And by Direction of the sacred Oracles, of consentient Church-History and right Reason, found my self oblig'd to assert, that not Emperors, Kings and Queens, *as such*, whether Heathen or Christian; but the *holy Apostles*, and their Successors to the End of the World, were originally vested by our *Lord Jesus* with this Power: That they execute the same, not in the Name, and by the Authority of the secular Sovereign, as his Creatures or Delegates, but in the Name of, and

4 A CONTINUATION of

immediate Subjection to, and Dependence upon *Jesus Christ*.

Hence, *Sir*, I concluded, that there is a real Distinction between the Mitre and the Crown, between Church and State, between the Bishop and the King, the Sacerdotal and Regal Powers.

But, *Sir*, I will not repeat; I rather beg Leave to refer you to the Letter itself, which I can scarcely abridge; where I think the Point is doctrinally establish'd, so that the Proof of it needs not be resum'd.

All then that remains, *Sir*, is to secure this weighty Truth against those Objections and Cavils, wherewith, as I have observ'd, ill Men seek to perplex it; and to disperse those Mists which they raise, those Clouds which they gather, in order to eclipse and obscure, and, if possible, to abolish it.

I heartily wish, *Sir*, there were no Occasion to proceed farther into the Merits of this Cause: And I cannot but think, that it would be as easy for the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, by an authoritative Ecclesiastick Censure, to blast the ill Principles of the Opposers of this Doctrine, without farther Debate; as it is for me to assign the main Reason of their opposing it.

The Reason, *Sir*, is obvious: They deny the Independence of the Church, in its purely Spirituals, upon the State; they throw the divine Commission of Bishops at the Feet of secular Princes, they do thus wholly subject the Mitre to the Crown, with a manifest Design to exalt themselves upon the Ruins of both.

The

The Author of that *very ill Book*, falsely entitled, *The Rights of the Christian Church*, sufficiently discovers this, by telling the World, that “^a The Church of England, as to its Polity and Discipline, is a perfect Creature of the Civil Power. ^b That all Spiritual Power is vested in the King; and that whatever the Bishops or other Ecclesiasticks have, is *deriv’d from him.*” Mighty kind-hearted! Whence is it, Sir, that they are so profuse in their Gifts to Kings? *There’s* ^c *a Snake in the Grass.* Their Gifts are extremely dear. They pretend to make a *Present* of a Spiritual *Supra-Papal* Power to our Kings and Queens, but upon express Condition that our Kings or Queens shall own themselves to be the precarious Creatures and Servants of the People: For the same *Author of the Rights*, &c. boldly says, ^d that “*All the Power the Magistrate can claim — is immediately from the People.*” And they know well enough, that if they can but once persuade the World, that the People have a Right to confer both *Spiritual and Temporal Power*; they have a Right to resume it to themselves, the [*odious pretended*] *Original of it*: The Issue of which would be a direful Cry about our Streets of *No Mitre, no Crown.*

But, Sir, those Levellers, those *Doctors of Resistance*, not being able to bring about such an

^a Rights, &c. Part. 1. Ed. 2. London Printed 1706. Pref. p. 4.

^b Ibid. Pref. p. 35, 36.

^c Timeo Danaos, & dona ferentes.

^d Rights, &c. p. 2.

6 A CONTINUATION of

Anarchical Resumption directly and at once, as they did in Forty one, do labour their Point another way: They, as the *Author of the Book of the Rights*, do artfully teach the secular Princes to invade the Hierarchical Powers, to execute the Episcopal Commission, and to degrade the *Bishops* almost into *Cyphers* and *Nullities*.

Hence those *Principles of Church-Unity* in their several Dioceses, whose Office it is, under *Christ*, to be Diffusers and Supporters of *Loyal Religion*, are by these Arts either tempted to a *Secular Spirit*, the better to secure their Ecclesiastical Tenures, which the *Author of the Rights*, in his *Dutch way of Management*, teaches to be dependent on the State; or else, ineffectually striving against these Artifices, they are fatally discourag'd, Discipline in its just Extent is render'd impracticable, or is much relax'd; hence many are tempted not only unjustly to condemn *their Persons*, but also their *most Sacred Office*; and thus Mens Minds being initiated in Schism, and disengag'd from the Laws of *Christ*, are wofully prepar'd to entertain all the Seeds of Faction, which those Resisters of Authority are always sowing.

In a word, Sir, the great Reason of their attempting by all means to weaken the *Mitre*, is that they may the more successfully attack the *Crown*; and in the End, glut their *unbounded Ambition* and *Covetousness* with the Spoils of both.

Tho', Sir, our Governours are well aware of this *ill Set of Men*, and a steddy regular Conduct

duct sufficiently appears against their bad Designs; yet are they so far from being out of Countenance, that short of all Modesty, as well as besides all Reason, they continue the old Opposition, and both from *Pulpit* and *Press*, and how many other ways I know not.

I have often humbly wish'd, Sir, with an awful Submission; that the *Mitre*, so nearly resembling *cloven Tongues*, may at last shew its peircing Efficacy in this Case, that *Aaron's Rod* may be lifted up, that the *Pastoral Staff* may interpose to ward off the pernicious Insolence, and that the *Spiritual Sword* may shew its Edge and its Use on this Occasion: *Soft Reproofs* do but tempt their Disdain, and cherish their Presumption; *this* would reclaim or silence them, or at least effectually prevent the open spreading of the Infection; for it would be impious not to believe, that *Our Lord Jesus* would bless his own appointed Censures, and support the sacred Persons of his Vicegerents, in the due and faithful Execution of the divine Commission.

In the mean time, Sir, it may not be amiss to consider the most *Popular Objections*, by which they attempt to demolish the *Episcopal Thrones*; which I shall do, as briefly as the Case will bear: And I hope, *thro' God's Blessing*, to work in them some Degree of Conviction, unless they have unalterably resolv'd never to be convinc'd.

It is *Objected*, that the supreme Civil Magistrate is a Person appointed to edify the Church, he being confessedly *Utriusque Tabula Custos & Vindex*,

Vindex, Keeper and Defender of both Tables of the Law, which relate to Spiritual as well as Secular Matters: Hence it follows, say the Objectors, there is no such Independence of the Mitre upon the Crown in Spiritual Matters, as is originally claim'd; no such Distinction as is asserted.

Answer. 1. The supreme Civil Magistrate, King or Queen, is not *absolutely necessary* to edify the Church, as *Bishops* and *Priests* are, *without whom* Christ has no visible Kingdom on Earth; and *with whom* Christ had an external visible Kingdom Three Hundred Years and upwards, before the Church came to have the Favour of the Secular Powers. 'Tis readily own'd, that without the Assistance of a Christian Civil Magistrate; the Edification of the Church might formerly have been, and may now be *externally slower and less vigorous*: But no Privation or intrinsic essential Defect in the Church was then, or could be now, tho' the World were not bless'd, *which God forbid*, with any Christian King or Queen.

2. The supreme Civil Magistrate is a Means to edify the Church, not by any elicit intrinsic Acts, not by any formally spiritual ecclesiastical Acts done by himself, *as King*, or by his Delegates; but by imperated commanded Acts extrinsically, requiring the Bishops to do their Duty, and *removendo prohibens*, by his Civil Sword, driving away wolvisb Hereticks and Schismaticks from his Subjects.

Hence

Hence, Sir, 'tis evident, that there is as great a Difference between the *Bishop's* and the *King's* being a Means to edify the Church, as there is between edifying it by elicite intrinsecal Acts, and edifying it only by imperated extrinsecal Acts: Yea, as vast a Difference as there is between an absolutely necessary Means, and no absolutely necessary Means; or if you please, Sir, as there is between a Means to the very *Esse* or Being, and a Means only to the *bene Esse* or Well-being of the Church. But as to this last Distinction, Sir, I doubt not, but that to prevent any unwary Reader's perverting it, you will allow the following Restriction, That the Christian Church had both a *Spiritual Being* and *Well-being*, several Centuries before there was any supreme Christian Civil Magistrate, to guard it with his Secular Power. This is uncontestable Fact. I beg Leave, Sir, for farther Illustration, to observe

3. That the supreme Civil Magistrate is such a Means for curing Souls, as he is for Bodies, when he provides bodily Physicians that can perform Cures, tho' he be no Physician himself: Thus is he a Means of edifying the Church *materialiter*, (as the Schools love to speak) but not *formaliter*, as Bishops and Priests are. And if you please, Sir, I'll turn the Tables, and put the Point in another View, thus: Physicians, Printers and Sailors, in their *lower*, as well as Kings or Queens in their *higher Spheres of Activity*, may contribute their respective Powers to such things as do *materially*, tho'

not *formally* promote a supernatural End, and edify the Church: Printers may print and publish the Holy Volume, Physicians may preserve or restore the Health of Bishops, Priests and Deacons; Saylor's may transport them to remote Countries, in order to convert or confirm Souls, And the King or Queen may command them to do all these things, and may politically enable and encourage, and upon Neglect punish them, as he is *utriusque Tabulae Custos & Vindex politicus*, Keeper and Civil Defender of both Tables of the Law; yet as none will say, that those Artists are Ecclesiastical Officers, or do *formally* edify the Church; so none can rightly say the same of Kings or Queens, *as such*: For tho' all their Powers, *in this Case*, be *objectively*, or in regard of the Object, and *extrinsecally* ecclesiastick and spiritual; yet the Powers of the Artists are formally and intrinsecally *Mechanical*, and the Power of the King or Queen is formally, and in it self, and intrinsecally *Political and Civil*; and so neither of the said Powers can be denominated *formally Spiritual*: For you very well know, Sir, that Powers have their Specification, Nature and Name, not from their *material*, but their *formal Objects*. So that this Objection vanishes. But, Sir, the Enemies of the *Mitral Powers* advance with much Assurance, and think to conquer them with their own Weapons, by turning the 37th Article of the Church of *England* into an

Objection. The Jewish Civil Magistrates, say they, were supreme ecclesiastical Rulers and Judges,

Judges, and were vested with a Power to command the Priests in Spirituals. Now 'tis plain, *say they*, that the 37th Article declares our Kings and Queens to have such Prerogative as hath been given always to all godly Princes, in Holy Scriptures, by God himself: Hence *they infer*, that according to the abovesaid Article, our Sovereign Kings and Queens have the same Power still, and consequently that the *Mitre* is not independent of the *Crown* in Spirituals.

Answer. 1. Supposing the Jewish Kings had been supreme in Ecclesiastical Affairs, as is objected, it is incumbent upon our Opponents to prove, which is not yet done, that they were *such*, by vertue of their Civil Supremacy; before it can be justly attempted to make our Christian Kings, *as such*, Ecclesiastical Potentates, *after the Jewish Example*.

2. Arguments drawn from some extraordinary Acts of some Kings, as *David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Jehoshaphat*; with a Design to contract the Hierarchical Powers, by extending the *Regal*, are cautiously excluded by the 37th Article. For it says, that **ONLY** such Prerogative as was **ALWAYS** given to **ALL** godly Princes, is attributed to our Kings and Queens; *viz.* such as are mention'd in the beginning of my first Letter, *p.* 3, 4, 5. And 'tis evident, *Sir*, that the following words of the Article, which are exegetical of the former, do fix this Regal Prerogative in a Political ruling Power *over all Persons Ecclesiastical as well as Temporal*, in restraining them with the Civil Sword when they are stub-

12 A CONTINUATION of

born Evil-doers. And *this* designedly, in just Opposition to the former Papal Exemptions of the Clergy from the Civil Jurisdiction of our Kings.

3. 'Tis false in Fact, that the godly Jewish Kings were supreme Ecclesiastical Administrators and Judges: For

It was not the *King's*, but ^e the *Priest's Office* to bless in the Name of the Lord; and consequently to judge who were fit Objects of the Sacerdotal Benediction.

It was not the *King's* ^f but the *Priest's Office* to sacrifice and burn Incense: Hence King *Uzziah*, for usurping this Peculiarity of the Priestly Office, was branded with *Leprosy* by God, and thrust out from the Congregation by the Priests, and dyed under the *visible Mark* of divine Vengeance.

It was not the *King's*, but the *Priest's Office* ^g to judge of the clean and the unclean.

The *Priests* and *Levites* were separated ^h to bear the Ark of the Covenant, and not the *King*.

The *Priests* and *Levites* ⁱ were set apart for the Service of the Tabernacle, and not the *King*.

The *Priest's Lips*, ^k and not the *King's*, were appointed to preserve spiritual Knowledge.

^e Deut. 21. 5. and Ch. 10. 8.

^f 2 Chron. 26. 16, 17, 18, &c.

^g Levit. 10. 10. Ch. 13. 3, 4, &c. 23.

^h Num. 16. 9. Josh. 3. 8. 1 Kings 8. 3. 2 Chr. 5. 7.

ⁱ Num 18. 3, 4, &c. 23.

^k Mal. 2. 7.

In view of this Distinction between the Sacerdotal and Regal Offices, under the Mosaick OEconomy; 'tis very probable that the King was anointed with a sort of Oyl inferior to that wherewith the Priest was anointed: For the *Priests* that had the holy Oyl upon their Heads, might not ^l lament for the Dead; but Kings might, as *David* did for ^m *Abner* and for *Abshalom*. If this be but a Conjecture, yet

'Tis certain, that their *Civil* and *Ecclesiastick* *Judicatures* and *Judges* were *distinct* and *different*. *Jehoshaphat* ⁿ set *Judges* in the Land throughout all the fenced Cities of *Judah*, City by City: therefore also at *Jerusalem* the chief fenc'd City. Moreover, ^o in *Jerusalem* did *Jehoshaphat* set of the *Levites* and *Priests*, &c. and said, Behold, ^p *Amariah* the Chief Priest is over you in all Matters of the Lord, and *Zebediah* the Son of *Ishmael*, the Ruler of the House of *Judah*, for all the King's Matters. Here's a most clear Distinction: For

1. The Civil Judicature was not confin'd to one Place, but was in every fenc'd City; whereas the Ecclesiastical Judicature was tyed to *Jerusalem*, ^q the place that the Lord did chuse.

2. The Judicature at *Jerusalem* in the 8th Verse, is usher'd in with a *Moreover*, which wou'd have been needless, if it had not been *Ecclesiastical*, and different from the former in the 5th Verse.

^l Levit. 21. 10.

ⁿ 2 Chron. 19. 5.

^q Deut. 17. 8.

^m 2 Sam. 3. 31. Ch. 18. 33.

^o Verse 8.

^p Verse 11.

14 A CONTINUATION of

3. The Civil Judicature in the 5th Verse, are call'd *Judges*, who could not be *Ecclesiasticks*, because he speaks of them Verse 8.

4. The Objects of these two Judicatories are very different: The Object of *the one*, is all the King's Matters; of *the other*, all the Lords Matters, Verse 13.

5. There were two different *Presidents*: *Amariah* over the Judges in all the Lord's Matters, *Zebadiab* over the Judges in all the King's Matters.

If, Sir, it be suggested, that tho' these two Judicatures were distinct, yet they were the mere Creatures of King *Jehoshaphat*: He appointed, charg'd and commanded them.

I reply 1. That these were *no new Judicatories* erected, but *old ones* restor'd by him; bearing Date from the time that God separated the Sacerdotal from the Regal Office, and settl'd the Priesthood in the House of *Aaron*, in the Tribe of *Levi*; after which, Kings might not execute the Sacerdotal Function. 2. The Jewish Kings commanding the Priests to do their Duty, was no more a Proof of their *Spiritual Sovereignty*, than the Prophets and Priests charging, rebuking and threatening the Kings, was a Demonstration of their *Civil Sovereignty*. 3. The King's Power of commanding, as *King*, must be commensurable to his Power of punishing the Transgressors of his Command; which, ever since *the foresaid Date*, was, and still is only exter-

* 2 Sam. 12, 8, —12.

Isa. 30. 33.

Jer. 22, 23. &c.

nally.

nally. 4. Tho' Kings or Queens formerly had, and still have a Right to command Bishops and Priests *accumulatively*; that is to do their Duty, to fulfil God's Will in the Administration of his Spiritual Kingdom: Yet they have no Right to command them *privatively*, *that is*, they have no Right to command them to betray their Spiritual Privileges, and surrender them to their King.

Objection. f " Two such Powers ruling the
" Body Politick, is as absurd as to suppose *two*
" Souls independent of one another, to govern
" the Body Natural. *Two Heads to the same*
" Body, whether Natural or Political, can serve
" to no other Use, than to make a *Monster* of
" it.

Answer. These Gentlemen are not ashamed to beg, when they cannot prove their Point. They suppose the Church and State to be *one and the same Body* or Society; whereas they are *two very distinct ones* in their Original, in their Nature and Constitution, in the Ends they aim at, and in the different Means by which they pursue their several Ends; as is already declar'd by way of *Antithesis* in the End of the *first Letter*. So that the *Monster* disappears, when we shew *two formally distinct Bodies* or Societies, to fix the *two Heads* upon.

The same Company of Men consider'd as *Citizens*, are a Civil Society subject to the King or Queen, who is to them, *under God*, the Head,

16 A CONTINUATION of

Principle and Source of all political *State-Unity*, Government and Influences: But the same Men consider'd *as Christians*, are a Church-Society subject to their Bishop, who is to them *under Christ*, the Head, Principle and Source of all spiritual *Church-Unity*, Government and Influences.

I hope then, *Sir*, it is beyond doubt, that the same Number of Men may be form'd into two formally distinct Societies, of different Natures and Denominations, under their distinct Heads, or influencing Governours: They are the same Men, the same Company of Men, *quatenus Men*, but the different instituted *Habitudes* and *Relations* they stand in to the Sacerdotal and Regal Sovereigns, in their vastly different Affairs spiritual and secular; do justly entitle them *singly* and *jointly* to different Characters and Denominations. Yea, *Sir*, in *purely Temporals*, the same Number of Men may be of two different Societies or Companies, as of the *South-Sea-Company*, and of the *East-India-Company*, which have distinct Charters and Governours, independent of each other.

Obj. " There cannot, there ought not to be
 " two such independent Powers in the same Na-
 " tion; because they are apt to clash and inter-
 " fere about the same things, to issue forth
 " contrary Commands to the same Persons, or
 " enjoin them different things at the same time.
 " And ^t can it be suppos'd, *say they*, that God,

^t Rights, &c. p. 35.

" who

who is the God of Order, and not of Confusion, would ever involve us in such inextricable Difficulties?

Ans. 1. The *Commissions* of the Bishop and the King or Queen, are so different in kind, and for so different Ends and Purposes, that they can never clash: They are like two parallel Lines that can never meet to cross each other; and consequently, if these Hierarchical and Secular Potentates did act within the Bounds of their proper respective Commissions, they could never juggle, thwart or interfere with each other; nor could the People be harass'd with contrary Injunctions: Then would the Priests ^u put the People in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates; then would Kings ^x be nursing Fathers, and Queens nursing Mothers to the Church.

2. If both Church and State Magistrates firmly believ'd, that neither of them receives his Commission and Authority from the other, but both from a Power that is superior to them both, who is Almighty to avenge himself on those who will not be determin'd by his Orders; then would they view their respective Commissions oftner, and be afraid to exceed; then would neither of them be as a bundle of Briars to one another, or to the People under them; then would such awful Impressions be made on each of them, as no haughty Ambition, pretend-

^u *Tit. 3. 1.*

^x *Isai. 49. 23.*

18 A CONTINUATION of

ed Reserves or temporizing Salvos, could ever erase.

3. Suppose, that in such an independent Constitution of Church and State, the Ecclesiastical and Secular Princes should transgress the Limits set them, and stretch their Line beyond its Measure, as has been, and may still be done; yet this is no Argument against *Fact*, that they are not so constituted: Nor is it a Proof, that such a Constitution should be sapp'd and blown up. The independent Constitution is not in Fault, but only such Governours or others, that *break in upon it*. Admit then the objected Inconveniencies and Difficulties, *there's a Remedy*.

If Bishops or Priests, *as such*, usurp any Branch of the Regal Power, or Temporal Jurisdiction; the King or Queen may, and ought to punish him to the same Degree, *at least*, as he wou'd any other Subject, for the like Offence.

If Secular Princes, *as such*, take upon themselves to execute the Priestly Office, or any Branch of it, in proportion to what ^y *Saul*, ^z *Uzziah* or ^a *Jeroboam* did, or otherwise *in the like Cases*; then I say, ^b as a *Right Reverend and Learned Prelate* solemnly preach'd before the Queen some time ago: "There would be a Nullity in every thing that the Prince did of this kind, and the Priest's Duty in this Case,

^y 1 Sam. 13. 9.

^z 2 Chron. 26. 16.

^a 1 Kings 12. 31. and 13. 33.

^b Bishop of Exon's Sermon before the Queen at St. James's, March 8. 1688, on Rom. 13. 4. p. 13. 8^{vo}, and published by Her Majesty's Special Command.

would be, to remonstrate to the Prince in the most decent and respectful Terms, the Unlawfulness of such an Attempt; nay, and to withstand him too, with such a sort of Force, as the most dutiful Son might use to restrain and hold back his Father from running into a Fire, or falling into a Pit: As the Priests of the Temple did, *when their King went into the Temple of the Lord, to burn Incense upon the Altar of Incense; they went in after him, says the Text, and withstood Uzziah the King, and said unto him, it appertaineth not unto thee to burn Incense unto the Lord, but to the Priests the Sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn Incense: Go out of the Sanctuary, for thou hast trespassed, neither shall it be for thine Honour from the Lord God.*

If, Sir, the temporal Sovereign shews himself inflexible, and will not be restrain'd by such Remonstrances, but continues his Encroachments; and even proceeds from bad to worse, until he becomes *an Original* in such sacrilegious Impieties: Tho' his Subjects, *of what Rank or Quality soever*, cannot upon pain of Damnation commence any hostile Resistance against him, or politically punish him; yet the Great God, King of Kings, *to whom alone he stands accountable*, will not fail to vindicate the Honour of his own Institutions, at the great Day of final Decision, if not before, as in the Case of King Uzziah.

If the Civil and Ecclesiastical Governours be suppos'd to command *contrary* or *different things*, and so to lay the *same Persons*, subject to both these Powers, under contrary or different Obligations: Certainly, Sir, in such a Case, one of them is in the Wrong, and abuses his Power. But is it reasonable, from a just Dislike of the *Abuse*, to infer an equal Dislike of the *right Use*? The Subject's Duty is plain, without casting off either his Ecclesiastical or Civil Governour. The Head-ach may be cur'd without cutting off the Head: For

If the *Matter* about which they give out such cross Orders, be order'd and determin'd by the *Divine Law*, either directly, or by right Consequence: Then such Direction is to be *peaceably* observ'd, whosoever he be that opposes it.

If the *Matter* about which they are suppos'd to issue forth such cross Orders, be *indifferent in it self*, which do's no otherwise oblige, but as it is commanded by a lawful Authority, that has Power to determine us in such Circumstances; then it either relates to *Civil Affairs*, or to *Ecclesiastical*.

If this *indifferent Matter* relates to *Civil Affairs*, then I humbly conceive, that the Bishops and Pastors of the Church, *as such*, would be altogether in the wrong, to countermand their Prince's Injunctions: And he might by *Secular Force* oblige them to desist, punishing them as Usurpers of Civil Authority.

If such *indifferent Matters* relate to *Ecclesiastical Affairs*, which the Hierarchical Powers judge

judge to be needful for the better and more regular Administration of the holy Offices, and the external Polity of the Church: Then, a good King or Queen in any Country, whose Understanding has been duely inform'd by his Spiritual Instructors, will not attempt to thwart the *Sacred College* in such Matters; but will rather, as he is politically concern'd in them, ratify them by his Civil Sanction. But if the supreme Civil Magistrate, in whose Breast are the *Arcana Imperii*, thinks fit to *advise*, or politically to *command* his governing Clergy to alter, or to add to, or diminish from such indifferent Matters, as being most conducive to the *publick Peace*; then the Loyal Clergy throughout the World know it to be their Duty, *as* to suffer under, rather than to *rebel* against their King commanding *sinful things*; *so* to obey him in all things lawful and *not contrary to the Divine Law*, as things in their own Nature indifferent are acknowledg'd to be.

Objection. St. Paul appeal'd from the Church to the State, from the *High Priest's* Tribunal to *Cesar's*: Which clearly shews, *say they*, that in St. Paul's Judgment, the *Mitre* should depend upon the *Crown*.

Answer. St. Paul appeal'd not from an Ecclesiastical Tribunal to ^d *Cesar's* in proper Church Matters. The *Jews* had combin'd ^e to murder him; but being ^f happily disappointed, they

^d *Acts* 25. 11.

^f *Acts* 23. 23, 24.

^e *Acts* 23. 12. — 25. 3.

pursu'd his Life in the *Roman Courts*; and knowing well enough, that the *Roman Deputies* reckon'd not any Accusation relating to the Jewish Religion, to be a Matter worthy ^s of *Death* or *Bonds*; they therefore principally charge him with ^h *Sedition*, a capital Crime, not doubting thus to work their Point. But the *Jews* not being able to prove their Charge against him, ⁱ either before *Fælix* Governour of *Cesarea*, or ^k before *Portius Festus* who succeeded him; and yet *St. Paul* observing the Partiality of *Festus*, that he was deliberating to throw ^l him into the Snares of those Men who thirsted after his Blood; he appeal'd from the partial *Festus* to *Cæsar*, from an inferior to a superior Civil Judge, as is ^m manifest; and not from an Ecclesiastical to a Civil Judge. And indeed, *Sir*, those who say, *St. Paul* appeal'd to an Heathen Emperor in Causes formally Ecclesiastical, must have a very *mean*, or a very *malicious Opinion* of him, in endeavouring to brand him with such a *ridiculous Action*, as referring his *Christian Faith* to the Decision of an *infidel Prince*; or appealing from the Church to one without the Church, in Matters properly and formally religious.

If, *Sir*, the Case be put in Christian Countries, our *Adversaries Scheme* do's quite subvert the Notion and Nature of an *Appeal*: For an *Appeal* is always from an inferiour to a superiour

^s *Acts* 18. 14, 15, 16. and *Ch.* 23. 29.

^h *Acts* 24. 5. ⁱ *Ibid.* v. 12. 13. 18.

^l *Ch.* 25. 9. compar'd with v. 2. 3.

^k *Ch.* 25. 7.

^m *Ibid.* v. 10, 11.

Judge, *in eadem serie*, in the same Nature and Kind of Judicatures, and not in different.

If it be suppos'd, that One is highly injur'd by the Church Governors; and Relief be ask'd. I conceive, Sir, that we ought to distinguish between a *Complaint* and an *Appeal*, and say, that if the Church Governours should at any time so proceed against common Justice, as to censure a Person unheard, or before Conviction, either by Confession, or by sufficient Witnesses; which yet by the way, I think is a *very uncharitable invidious Supposition*: And if this Person be affected in his *Civil Rights*, by Intervention of the secular Laws, then the injur'd Person may complain to the secular Prince; who in view of rescuing his Subject from *temporal Difficulties*, may effectually oblige the Ecclesiastical Judges to *re-consider the Case*.

Objection. The Independence of the Church upon the State in its pure Spirituals, is an *odious Presbyterian Doctrine*; and therefore away with it. At this Rate speaks a modern ⁿ Author.

In *answering this terrible Charge*: I will 1. shew, that supposing it were maintain'd by the *Presbyterians*, it is not therefore merely upon that account to be rejected. 2. That there is a great difference between the *Presbyterians* and us, as to this Doctrine: And 3. That there is a greater, yea a *thorough Disagreement*, in the *Application* of it.

ⁿ New High Church turn'd old Presbyterian. *Utrum horum.* London, Printed 1709. p. 6.

24 A CONTINUATION of

1. Tho' the Point in hand were a Favourite of the *Presbyterians*, we must not *eo nomine*, only for that Reason, cashier it. There are few or no Sects so abandon'd to Error, as not to retain some Truths, which we ought not to discard or reverse. He must be a very *Infidel*, that would deny the ever-glorious Doctrine of the *Trinity in Unity*, because the *Presbyterians* embrace it.

And here, for Information's sake; I beg leave, Sir, to propound a few Queries.

Qu. 1. Setting aside the new word Transubstantiation, and the gross Corporal Presence being excluded. I ask, Whether the Clergy ought to strike this Expression out of our Catechism: *The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and receiv'd by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper?* Because Mr. Calvin, the Father of the *Presbyterians*, most deliberately affirms, " ° That the true substantial Body and Blood of Christ is exhibited to, " and receiv'd by the Faithful, in the Lord's " Supper: That they receive it not by Imagination only, or by mental Understanding; " but do enjoy it really and indeed, &c. That " p that Body and Blood of Christ, in which " he

° *Ceterum his absurditatibus sublati, quicquid ad exprimendam veram substantialemque Corporis ac Sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub sacris Cœnæ Symbolis fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest; libenter recipio: atque ita ut non Imaginatione duntaxat aut mentis Intelligentia percipere, sed ut re ipsa frui in alimentum vitæ æternæ intelligantur.* Calv. Institut. l. 4. c. 17. §. 19.

† *Dico igitur, in Cœnæ Mysterio per Symbola panis & vini, Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeoque Corpus & Sanguinem ejus, in quibus*

“ he fulfill’d all Obedience to procure Righteous-
 “ ness for us, is truly given to us; whereby
 “ first we should become one Body with him,
 “ and then being Partakers of his Substance;
 “ may feel his Power in communicating all his
 “ Benefits.

Must we be oblig’d, Sir, to say, that in this
 Point of the *Real Presence* there is more than a
Modal difference, or more than a difference as to
 the Manner of its being there, between us and
 our Adversaries; because the same *Calvin* says,
 that *there is no more?*

Must we expunge the abovesaid Sentence
 out of our Catechism, because a *Scotch* & *Presby-*
terian Catechism, which I had the Honour to
 see in the Honourable Mr. *Archibald Campbell’s*
 curious Library, teaches as follows? I will not
 deviate from the Original so much, as to alter
 the Spelling. The Rubrick or Title runs thus,

“ *Christis naturall bodie is receaued*

“ *Question.* Then we receauie onlie the to-
 “ kens, and not his bodie?

“ *Answer.* We receauie his very substantial
 “ bodie and bloode.

bus omnem Obedientiam pro comparanda nobis iustitia adimplevit: quod
scilicet primum in unum Corpus cum ipso coalescamus; deinde partici-
pes Substantiae ejus facti, in bonorum omnium communicatione virtu-
tem quoque sentiamus. Calv. Inst. l. 4. c. 17. §. 11.

“ *Ergo tantum de modo quaestio est. Ibid. §. 31.*

“ A Short Summe of the whole Catechisme, &c. gathered by
 Mr. *Johne Craig* Minister of God’s Worde, to the King’s M. imprint-
 ed at *Edinburgh*, by *Henrie Charteris*. Anno. M. D. LXXXI.
 Cum Privilegio Regali.

D

“ Qu.

26 A CONTINUATION of

“ *Qu.* How can that be proven?

“ *An.* By the truth of his Wordes; and Sacrament.

“ *Qu.* Declare that by the Sacrament.

“ *An.* As that naturall substance of the Elementis is giuen, even so the naturall substance of CHRISTIS bodie.

“ *Qu.* But his naturall bodie is in heauen.

“ *An.* No dout, but yet we receaue it in earth.

“ *Qu.* How can that be?

“ *An.* By the wonderfull working of the holie Spirit.

Q. 2. Mr. Richard Baxter says, ^f “ *What Objective presence to the senses, eyes and ears, of those that heard Christ and his Apostles, and saw their Miracles, was to the first Converts in those times, that partly Tradition is to us, or the necessary Medium. The Words could not come down to us, without some to deliver them: And we have, says he, the Bible by Tradition.*” Now, Sir, I desire to be resolv’d, whether we are oblig’d to deny all this, only because a *Presbyterian Rabbi* asserts it?

Qu. 3. A Provincial Assembly of *Presbyterian Preachers*, arguing against the *Sectarian Congregational Independents*, ^t affirms and ^u largely proves, that the *English Diocesan Bishops* and

^f Full and easy Satisfaction which is the true and safe Religion. London, Printed 1674. p. 22.

^t *Jus. Divin. Minist. Evang. part 2. p. 27, 28.*

^u *Ibid. p. 30, 31.*

Ministers are true, and not Antichristian. Shall we, Sir, deny; because they, *tho'self-condemn'd*, affirm this?

Qu. 4. The same *Presbyterian Provincial Assembly* declares to the World, ^w that *Popish Ordination* and *Baptism* are sound for the substance: ^x That the *Ministry* passing to us *thro' Rome* is as valid as the *Scriptures*, *Sacraments*, or any other *Gospel Ordinances* which we now enjoy; which, *say they*, do all descend to us from the *Apostles thro' the Romish Church*: And that the *false Worship*, &c. ^y of the *Church of Rome* do's not unchurch her.

Now, Sir, I desire to be exactly inform'd, Whether we must reject these Positions, because embrac'd by *Presbyterians*? And then: Whether rejecting them as false, would not sap the Foundation of the Reformation?

Qu. 5. Whether ought we to deny *the Being* of ^z the *Holy Catholick Church*, and the Necessity of the Communion of Saints therein, or the Necessity of being in her Bosom in order to obtain Pardon and Salvation, because *Calvin* the Patriarch of the *Presbyterians* says so? And is it, Sir, a *Presbyterian Error* to affirm that the Church is but *One*, or as *Calvin* says, " ^a that it [the Church] is call'd Catholick or

^w *Ibid.* p. 43 and p. 41.

^x *Ibid.* p. 33.

^y *Ibid.* p. 42, 43.

^z *Extra ejus [Catholica Ecclesie] gremium nulla est speranda peccatorum remissio, nec ulla salus.* *Calv. Institut. l. 4. c. 1. §. 4*

^a *Ideo Catholica dicitur seu Universalis [Ecclesia] quia non duas aut tres invenire liceat quin discerpatur Christus, quod fieri non potest.* *Ibid. l. 4. c. 1. §. 2.*

“ Universal, because we cannot find two or
 “ three Churches, but that Christ must be torn
 “ afunder ; which is impossible ?

Qu. 6. Must this Assertion, “^b We are as-
 “ sur’d that Truth shall always abide with us,
 “ so long as we are kept in the bosom of
 “ the Church, be rejected, because *Calvin*
 “ held it ?” Must this Position be cashier’d,
 that tho’ the Catholick Church, which knows
 but in part, may err in some things, yet cannot
 fall into Fundamental, Mortal and incurable
 Errors, such as would take away the Name and
 Nature of a true Church, and destroy the Body
 of Christ ; seeing he has promis’d that the
 “ Gates of Hell shall not [*so*] prevail ?

But 2. There is a great Difference between
 the *Presbyterians* and us, as to the Doctrine of
 Independency in hand, for tho’ they deny
 their Church Power to depend upon Kings,
 yet, I appeal to their Conscience, would not
 they have the *Power* and *very Being of Kings* to
 depend upon themselves ? Will they do *any Right*,
 or take *any Wrong* in this Case, when ’tis in
 their Power to do otherways ? *Let former Days*
answer. Have they not extended their pretend-
 ed Ecclesiastical Power to purely *secular Mat-*
ters, and taken upon them to sit as Judges in
 Points of common *Trade and Commerce* ? Did
 they not by an Act of Assembly at *Dundee*

^b *Accedit, quod Veritatem, dum in Ecclesia sinu continemur, sem-*
per nobis constaturam, securi sumus. Ibid. §. 3.

^c *St. Matthew 16. 18.*

1592. ^d prohibit the Scots trading with any of the *King of Spain's Dominions*? When the *King of Scotland* commanded his Citizens of *Edinburgh* to treat the Ambassadors of the French King at a *splendid Dinner* 1581, did not they command a *Fast* on the same very day, * as the *Author of the Rights* tells us when he perversly attempts to turn that *gross Disloyalty* into an Argument against us. Have they not over-rul'd Acts of Parliament ^f by Acts of their Assembly, and hookt in every thing under their Cognizance in *Ordine ad Spiritualia*? Don't they add the *Temporal* to their *pretended Spiritual Sword*, and have they not upon Principle fought against their King, and at last murder'd him to advance their *new ill-form'd Discipline*? Do not their Parliament Sermons in the Years of their *great Rebellion* abundantly declare this? And does not their present *dear Doctrine* of Resistance shew that they are *no Changelings*, and that their former *bloody Principle* scorns a *Revolution*?

On the contrary, *Sir*, our Doctrine is, that Christ's Kingdom the Church is ^g not of this World, and so claims not any Power of determining *State-Matters*; it entrenches not in the least upon the Regal Potentates, but strenuously maintains, that our Kings and Queens hold their Crowns independent of any but God:

^d A.Bp. *Spotswood's Hist.* p. 393. cited by the Author of *Toleration discuss'd*, &c. Printed at London, 1670. p. 399.

* *Rights, &c.* Part 1. Ed. 2. p. 34.

^f *Spotswood's Hist.* p. 418. cited in *Toleration discuss'd* p. 321.

^g *St. John* 18. 36.

Hence

Hence is the Motto, *DIEU ET MON DROIT*, God and my Right: Hence is *DEI GRATIA* stamp't on our Coin, as the Emperours had upon theirs a Hand coming out of the Clouds, holding a Crown and placing it on their Heads. I [*not the Clergy, or Laity, or both,*] have said, ^h Ye are Gods. They are Children not of the *most Voices*, but of the *most High*: They are the *Lord's Anointed*, and not the *Peoples*. And, Sir, the Asserters of this Doctrine are so far from supplanting or vexing Kings, that in case *they* oppose the Clergy in the Discharge of their purely Spiritual Offices, *such Clergy* is taught to use no other Arms but *Prayers and Tears*, to attempt no Methods but what are *purely Spiritual*. They chuse rather to *suffer Wrong*, than to *do it*; they know, that *AS* in some Cases 'tis necessary not to obey, *SO* in all Cases 'tis necessary not to resist their King or Queen in an hostile Manner, as the *Presbyterian Doctors of Resistance* have done.

3. Tho' the *Presbyterians* and we were agreed in this Doctrine of Church Independency, as You see, Sir, we are not; yet still there's a *thorough Disagreement* between us, as to the *Application* of the Doctrine.

We say that our *Blessed Lord* committed the Authoritative Administration of his Spiritual Kingdom, the Church, to his *Apostles* and *their Successors the Bishops*, as his Vice-gerents; unto the End of the World, as appears by ⁱ their Commission.

^h Ps. 82. 6.

ⁱ St. Matt. 28. 18, 19, 20.

'Tis certain that the *Apostles* exercis'd a Power superiour to all the other Officers of the Church; and it were absurd to imagine, that the Institution of that *Order of Persons*, who were to be Church Governours, and the *general Methods of Government* then settl'd and Ordinarily practis'd by the *Apostles*, should be only *Local, Personal and Temporary*, like some *Dials* and *Almanacks*, calculated only for some special Meridians: For at this bold rate, audacious Men might dispute the other Evangelick Institutions out of the Church, and say, that they were to continue only for *one Age*.

We have, Sir, as certain an account of the Succession of this supreme Ecclesiastical Order of *Bishops* to the *Apostles*, in the greater Churches, as *Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome and Alexandria*; and that in the earliest times, in which alone the *Presbyterians* doubt of it; as we have of the Succession of our *English Bishops*, even from the Reformation: Yea, Sir, the Government of the Church by *Bishops* having *Presbyters* and *Deacons* Subjects to them, has, in Consequence of Christ's Promise, descended with the *other Fundamentals* of Christianity, and with the *same Evidence* thro' all Ages, and in all Places, where the Christian Religion has extended itself.

On the contrary, Sir, the *Presbyterians* have, in direct Opposition, rebell'd against, and rejected the supreme Ecclesiastick Order and Authority of *Bishops*, to whom Christ committed this independent Church Power: And not only
fo,

so, but have usurp'd and *sacrilegiously* apply'd it to themselves; and so have as much as in them lies, overthrown the original unalterable Divine Constitution of the *Catholick Church*, and effectually thrown themselves out of it.

These *Presbyterians*, and the other *Sectarians* sprung out of their Bowels, tho' they were exactly right in this Doctrine of the Church's Independency in *Spirituals* upon the Crown; as they are not, yet they would have *no Right* to apply it to themselves, or to put in a Claim against the Encroachments of any Secular Potentates; because they have neither Succession nor Ordination, neither Bishops, Priests nor Deacons, without which there can be no Church. They have no Portion of Spiritual Power deriv'd to them from *Christ*, having cut themselves off from the rightful Successors of the *Apostles*, whom the *blessed Jesus* sent, as his Father sent him; and consequently, they have no Reason to expect that God should ratify any thing in Heaven which they pretend to act on Earth, in *their usurp'd Exercise* of independent Spiritual Authority.

I am aware, Sir, that such Suggestions as these are call'd very uncharitable, by the Gentlemen of Latitude, who seem to have forgot the true Notion of the Church, the *Peculium* and Christian Priesthood. *What? To unchurch such great Numbers, and involve them in all the dreadful Consequences! How uncharitable, say they, besides the Affront put upon the Secular Potentates that tolerate and countenance them.*

But, Sir, all this will vanish by considering, that no Body excludes them from the *Catholick Church*, but themselves: That 'tis by *their own Act*, in rejecting the Church's Government and Governours by Divine Institution, that they *cut themselves off from the Church*, and forfeit those spiritual Privileges annex'd to its Communion. And, Sir, when People openly and avowedly reject an *instituted Fundamental* of Church Government, and yet claim *Church Privileges*, and among the rest, Independency upon the Crown in Spirituals; 'tis no ways uncharitable, openly to tell them of it, *let their Numbers be ever so great*: For great Numbers in a gross fundamental Error, don't extenuate, but aggravate the Fault, and loudly demand us to oppose it, *in Charity to their Persons*.

As to *their Pretence* of our affronting the Secular Potentates, who, *they say*, do tolerate and countenance them in their independent Church Power. This, Sir, is a *mere Bug-bear*: For those Princes have nothing to fear from Men of *unconditionally Loyal Principles*, without *Reserves* or *Salvoes*. Besides, Sir, however the Civil Sovereign may permit *Rebels* against the *Episcopal Order* amongst us, as God Almighty permits the Devil to run to and fro *in Chains*, to exercise the Faith, Patience and Courage of his People; yet it would be impious to suppose, that any King or Queen who is entirely for Episcopal Church Government, should heartily approve a Rebellion against it. Hence it is, that the *Act of Exemption* from the Penalties of certain Laws,

34 A CONTINUATION of

in Favour of the *English Dissenters*, commonly but *improperly* call'd the *Act of Toleration*, looks upon them as no part of the Catholick Church, in that it expressely calls *the Orders of their Dissenting Teachers*, **PRETENDED HOLY ORDERS**; which is to condemn them as effectually, as the State can do in *Church Cases*: For

'Tis most certain, that *pretended* holy Orders are not *true real* Holy Orders, and what is not true real Holy Orders in *England*, cannot be so in any other Part of the World; and such as have no true real Holy Orders, cannot *Authoritatively administer* the Holy Offices, and there is no *Church-State*, where *no due Care* is taken for such Administrations: And consequently, **OUR DISSSENTERS** having taken *no Care* for better Orders than they had, when the *Act of Exemption* pass'd in their favour; are in the declar'd Sense of that Act, **NO CHURCH**: And so have no Power to conduct the purely Spirituals, independently on the Crown; nor should they pretend to it.

If any unwary Members of the Church of *England* do abet the *Presbyterians Pretensions* to a Church State, as indeed they boast of having many such Friends; I wou'd put a few *Queries* to the Abettors.

Query 1. When did this Presbyterian Anti-Episcopal pretended Church commence? In what Age? Whether in the Apostles time, or how long since? Let them produce the Originals of such a Church, and the *Epocha* of the Succession of their Ministers?

Qu. 2. Let them shew us, in what part of the World there was ever any visible Church of their Anti-prelatick Stamp and Discipline, applied to, and distinguish'd from other Sects of Christians, for the first Fourteen Hundred Years after our Saviour?

Qu. 3. If their Church has subsisted all that time in a *State of Invisibility*, unknown to all the World besides themselves: Let them demonstrate this unto us? They are under no Persecution, the Secret may be divulg'd.

Qu. 4. Supposing the *Presbyterians* cou'd demonstrate this, which is yet impossible; how can they reconcile such an *invisible State* of their Anti-prelatick Church, with our Saviour's Veracity, when he said, ** Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World.* And that *1 the Gates of Hell should never prevail* against his Church? How can they reconcile *their invisible Circumstances* with our Saviour's speaking of his Church, as *a City set ^m on an Hill, that cannot be hid?* And as a Society that should always be apply'd to, seen, heard and understood? He *n* [whosoever he be, and *at what time soever,*] that will not hear the Church, *let him be unto thee as an Heathen, &c.*

In a word, Sir, if they be *Christ's Church*, a Succession of whose *Pastors*, as the Principle of *Unity* to the Church, is *o* perpetually guarded by his Promise; else it had been the most precarious uncertain thing in the World: Then

** St. Matth. 28. 20.*

1 Ibid. 16. 18.

m Ibid. Ch. 5. 14.

n Ibid. Ch. 18. 17.

o Eph. 4. 8, 11, 12, 13. St. Mat. 28 20.

Qu. 5. Whether the Presbyterians can deduce the uninterrupted Mission and Succession of their Ministers, from the Apostles times, thro' all Ages, to this very Day?

If, Sir, it be impossible for them to do this, as certainly it is, then they have *no Bishop, no Priest*; without whom, as *P St. Ignatius* co-temporary with the *Apostles* says, there cannot be so much as the *Name of a Church*: And if so, they have no right to claim or to exercise any *Church Power*; for as *St. Cyprian* says of the Schismatics in his Days, ⁹ they succeed to no Body, by whom they can derive such a Power, but proceed from themselves, and are the Original of their own Authority: Which is in effect, to be *lamentably independent upon Christ himself*.

Thus you see, Sir, with how little Reason 'tis objected to Episcopalians, that the Independency of the Church, in its purely Spirituals, upon the State, as above explain'd, is a Presbyterian Doctrine; seeing we so vastly differ from them in the Doctrine itself, and *totally* in the Application of it: The Difference, at least, being as great as was between the Royalists and the Rebels in another Case, when the Rebels apply'd the Substantials of Regal Sovereignty, to that execrable tyrannical Usurper Oliver Cromwell.

But, Sir, this is not all: The *Author of the Rights, &c.* pursues this Doctrine with a more terrible

⁹ *Χωρίς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔκλειψεν.* Ignat. Ep. ad Tralle-
sios. Oxon. Edit. 1708. p. 82.

⁹ *Succedunt nemini, a seipsis orti.*

Objection. "The Independence of the Church, in its purely spiritual Administrations, upon the State; is a Popish Doctrine;" as that Gentleman says expressly in a great many places of his Book; or to the same purpose.

Answer 1. 'Tis too well known, Sir, that the word *Popery*, which always excites the utmost Resentment of Englishmen, has been often cunningly misapply'd to the most Primitive Truths, to serve a turn: The Trinity, ^r Infant Baptism, ^r the Immortality of the Soul, and ^u an ordain'd Ministry have been, and are still call'd *Popish*, by such as formerly had, and still have a mind to extirpate these Doctrines.

In the beginning of the *great Rebellion*, when they were contriving ^w *ROOT AND BRANCH WORK*, *POPERT* was the *Word* perpetually founded in the People's Ears, to engage them to lay to an *AX*. "^x He, [the venerable *Archbishop* "*Laud*] said the *then* great Speech-maker, pleads fair for a Patriarchate — He pleads "*Popeship* under the Name of a Patriarch: "And I much fear, *said he*, lest the end and "top of his Patriarchal Plea may be as that of

^r Mysteries discover'd by *Paul Best*. 1647. p. 5, 11. cited in a Testimony of the Truths of *Jesus Christ*, &c. Printed 1648. and subscribed by 52 *Presbyterian Ministers*. p. 6, 7.

^r Vanity of Childish Baptism. *Part*. 2. p. 30. Cited *Ibid*. p. 18.

^r Man's Mortality. Printed 1643. p. 56. Cited *Ibid*. p. 19, 20.

^u *De Laune's Plea*, &c. recommended by *D. Fox*. 1706. p. 21, 22.

^w A Collection of Speeches made by *Sir Edward Dering*. Lond. Printed 1642. p. 73.

^x *Ibid*. p. 8. The Speech was made in the House of Commons. November 23. 1640.

38 A CONTINUATION of

“ *Cardinal Pole* his Predecessor, who would
 “ have two Heads, One, *Caput Regale*; an-
 “ other, *Caput Sacerdotale*: A droud Paral-
 “ lel, to set up the *Mitre* as high as the *Crown*.”
 Thus *that Manager*. The Artists in levelling
 alarum’d the People with a continual Cry of
Popery, Popery; as a sort of Witch-craft, to
 scare them from every thing which they were
 pleas’d to persecute with that *frightful Sound*.

2. Supposing, but not granting, that this
 Doctrine, as above explain’d, were exactly as-
 serted by the *Romish Church*: I pray, Sir, to
 be satisfy’d in the following *Queries*.

Qu. 1. Is it reasonable to reject any Doctrine
 that the *Church of Rome* Teaches, *ONLY* be-
 cause she teaches it, without farther Enquiry
 into the Merits of the Cause? Must we turn
Infidels, in pure spite to those of the *Roman*
Communion? They maintain the *Apostles Creed*,
 must we therefore reprobate and discharge it?
 Are there not, Sir, a great many things that
 the Papists say and hold, which are *no Superfa-*
tations of Popery, but genuine Branches of true
 Christianity, which may be said *in terminis* by
 Protestants, and yet they never a whit the
 worse, but much the better?

Qu. 2. Must we be oblig’d entirely to reject
 the following Points, *without Explication*, be-
 cause the *Church of Rome* literally asserts them,
 tho’ *She* too often adds *erroneous Superstructures*
 which we disown, and most uncharitably differs
 from us as to the Beneficial Application of the
 uncontroverted Truths; while *She*, tho’ but an
 unsound

unsound Part of the Catholick Church, do's most unjustly call her self the Whole Catholick Church, and Doctrinally engrosseth the saving Benefits of all reveal'd Truths and Ordinances to her self, exclusive of us; which we do not, exclusive of her?

I desire, *Sir*, that to avoid Misunderstanding, as well as to prevent Repetition, You would be pleas'd to keep in Mind the Contents of the second Query, while You read the four immediately following.

Qu. 3. Whether it be a Popish Error to assert an uninterrupted Lineal Succession of Bishops and Priests, *in virtue of our Saviour's y Promise*, as Essentially necessary to his Church; because Papists speak to the same effect? And hence, Whether the Doctrine of the *Perpetual Visibility of the Catholick Church* from its very Beginning to the Consummation of all things, tho' as to some Parts or particular Members of it, obscured for a time, be a *Popish Invention*, because the Papists assert the same; tho' they most unjustly apply it *only* to themselves? Was *Bishop Jewel* in the wrong for saying, that " ^a the General or outward Church of God is visible and may be seen?" Was *Dr. Ri. Field* infected with Popery, for affirming, that " ^a it cannot be

^y *St. Matth. 28. 20.*

^z *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, &c. London, Printed 1571. p. 428.*

^a *Lib. 3. p. 19. cited by Richard Montague in his Appello Casarem. A just Appeal from two unjust Informers, London, Printed 1625.*

^b 137. This Book was Approved and Licensed by *Dr. Francis White* Dean

40 A CONTINUATION of

“ but they that are the true Church, must, by
 “ Profession of the Truth, make themselves
 “ known, in such sort, that by their Profession
 “ and Practice, they may be discern’d from other
 “ Men ? ” Whether it be not an Impeachment
 of the Divine Veracity, Power, and Goodness, to
 say, that the *Catholick Church* mention’d in our
 Creed, ever was or can be reduc’d to an invisi-
 ble State, so as not to be seen, heard or pub-
 lickly understood: Forasmuch as her Sovereign
 King, her Rock and Protector has, in that as
 well as other Respects, engag’d his Omnipotence
 in Opposition to the Gates [the utmost Power
 and Policy] of Hell: And in Consequence of
 that, has, in the Case of Offences, left a per-
 petual standing Rule, **TELL IT UNTO THE
 CHURCH**, and if he neglect to **HEAR THE
 CHURCH**, let him be unto thee as an *Heathen
 Man* and a *Publican* ?

Qu. 4. Whether, Sir, we are oblig’d to de-
 ny, because *those of the Roman Communion*, tho’
 by gross Misapplication of it *only* to themselves,
 do affirm, that the Holy Scriptures are commit-
 ted only to the One Catholick Church, as
 b Guardian and Keeper of them, and that the
 Truth is only to be sought and ordinarily found
 there; all out of her having lost all Right and
 Claim to those Spiritual Treasures, Privileges

Dean of *Carlisle*, as agreeable to the Doctrine, Faith and Discipline
 established in the Church of *England*. Feb. 15. 1564. See from p.
 132. to p. 140. of *Montague’s Appeal*.

1 Tim. 3. 15. 2 Tim. 1. 13.

and

and Benefits: Whatever they may pretend to the contrary? Whether, *Sir*, this Article of the Church of England, ^c *the Church hath Authority in Controversies of Faith*: Whether the Exposition of the Catholick Church, tor Apostolical *Universal Tradition*, as being the best Comment upon the Holy Scriptures, the best Guide in such doubtful Matters, must be arraign'd; because the Papists do in *general Terms* say the like, tho' differing from us in *particular Application*? Whether some things in *St. Paul's Writings*, ^d *hard to be understood*,
^e "Don't make the early Histories and Practices
 " of the Church, not only lawful, but necessa-
 " ry Explainers of such Places of Scripture?
 " Whether ^f (in the Case of *Arius*) the Bishop
 " of *Alexandria's* Question put to the other Bi-
 " shops in Synod, *Which of you ever heard such*
 " *things*? was not a proper Method to find out
 " any Heresy or novel Doctrine, and to know the
 " Catholick Doctrine which had been univer-
 " sally receiv'd? Whether the universal Church
 " in all Ages, tho' she has no Power to impose
 " any new Article of Faith, be not yet a com-
 " petent sufficient Witness, what that Doctrine
 " and Faith is, which was once deliver'd to the
 " Saints?

* Article 20 of the Church of England.

^a 2 Pet. 3. 16.

* See Queries to the Presbyterians of Scotland, by a Gentleman of that Country. Printed for Geo. Strahan at the Golden Ball against the Royal Exchange, 1702 p. 1.

^f *Ibid.* p. 12.

Q. 6. Whether, as the present Bishop of *Sarum* says, it would not have been ^s a fullen and childish Peevishness to have chang'd the formal words us'd in the Imposition of Hands, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, because it was us'd in the Church of *Rome*?

Qu. 7. Whether we must expunge a Collect out of our Liturgy, and renounce the Guardianship of Angels, ⁿ *their succouring and defending us on Earth*, their kind and constant Care for the Children of God, because those of the *Roman* Communion thankfully acknowledge their Assistance?

But 2. Our Doctrine concerning the Distinction between the *Mitre* and the *Crown*, and the Independence of the Church in its purely Spiritual Administrations, upon the State, is not the same with, but vastly different from the *Papal* Doctrines concerning them.

I. The *Papal* Doctrine about this Point is, that the *Pope* is the *Primary Subject* of purely Spiritual Church Power, yea that the Episcopal Power ¹ is wholly in the *Pope*, as its Source, ——— who shares out to the other Ecclesiasticks, as his Delegates only, such Degrees of it as he pleases to communicate from his pre-

^s *Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England*, by Gilbert Burnet [now Bishop of *Sarum*.] London Printed for E. H. and T. H. for R. Chiswel, at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1707. Pref.

ⁿ *St. Michael and All Angels*.

¹ Card. Palavicini's History of the Council of Trent, L. 8. c. 13. and L. 4. c. 12. cited by the Author of the *New Politick Lights of Modern Rome's Church Government*. Eng. Edition, 1678. p. 84, 85.

tended Sovereign Plenitude: *Diego Lainez*, General of the *Jesuits*, openly declar'd this in the Council of *Trent*, in an Oration which he then solemnly made against the Divine Rights of Bishops. We say on the contrary, that *every Bishop* has a Divine Right, that the *College of Bishops* is the *Subject of the Power of the Keys*, that as the Reverend and Learned *Dr. George Hickes* observes, * “The Care of the Catholick Church
“ was committed jointly, as well as severally,
“ and in whole, as well as in part, to the Apostles and their Successors the Bishops. In
“ which the Government of the Church differs
“ from the Government of the World.

2. The *Pope* would have the Clergy independent on the State in Temporal Matters: He exempts the Goods and Persons of *Clergymen* from the *Civil Justice* of the Kingdom, and the Cognisance of the Civil Judicatures, and sets up other Tribunals vested with Power of Life and Death; which is destructive to the Rights of Kings. On the contrary, our Church disclaims all external Force whatsoever; we steadfastly maintain the King's or Queen's Supremacy over all Persons Ecclesiastical as well as Civil, in all Temporal Civil Affairs: Yea that the Regal Supremacy extends it self not only to all Persons, but also to all Causes, as well *Ecclesiastical* as Temporal, in a *purely Civil Political Way*.

* *The Christian Priesthood Asserted, &c.* Edit. 3. 1711. p. 211.

3. The Pope exalts the *Mitre* above the *Crown* in *Temporals*: He asserts, that Kings depend upon him for their Crowns, in that he pretends to exterminate or depose them. This deposing Doctrine was affirm'd by the Council of *Lateran* c. 3. A. D. 1215. and was practis'd by six Popes successively, during what was call'd the Holy League in *France*; of whom every one join'd with the League against the King. See the *Case of the Regale and of the Pontificate*. We on the contrary, do strenuously maintain *Non-resistance*; that it is utterly unlawful ¹ "tho' the King or
" Queen should turn Apostate, Heretick or Ty-
" rant, to lift up any Hand against him, except
" in Prayer to Heaven.

In a word, *Sir*, the Independence of the Church, as above explain'd, is so far from being a *Papal* Doctrine and Practice, that it is really such an Enemy to the *Pope's Supremacy*, as that undoubtedly it *must needs be abolish'd wherever our Doctrine takes Place*. The Partition of Ecclesiastical Power between the *Mitre* and the *Crown*, those Degrees of the Dependence of the Church, in its purely Spirituals, upon the State, which are yet in use, were the Effects of *Papal Policy* to aggrandize the *See of Rome*, and to usher in the *Pontificate*: For the *Popes* or *Bishops of Rome* not being content with that Primacy of Order, which was affixt to their Sees, *jure Ecclesiastico*, graspt at a *Supremacy*

¹ The Reverend Dr. George Hickes's *Prefatory Discourse in Answer to the Rights*. &c. Edit. 3. p. 187.

and Paramount Principality of Power; but observing, that they could neither obtain or support their encroaching universal Super-eminence over all the Bishops of the World, without the Assistance of the Kings of the Earth; they confederated with those Kings, and by *Concordats* and Agreements, form'd a *Partition* of the Ecclesiastical Powers. They were willing to give some Share to the Kings and Secular Princes, that they might secure all the rest to themselves, and crush the inherent governing Rights of the other Bishops. It was, Sir, by such Policy, that the Power of the whole Episcopal College was swallow'd up by the single See of Rome, to the vast Prejudice of the ancient Aristocratical and Collegiate Government of the Catholic Church. There remains, Sir, another terrible thing which they vehemently urge, as their last Struggle for a sinking Cause.

Objection. This Independence of the Church upon the State (as the *Author of the Rights, &c.* frequently urges in his Preface) is contrary to the Laws of the Land, to the *Regal Supremacy* establish'd at the Reformation, by Act of Parliament, at the *Request of the Clergy*,^m as this Author says, and penn'd in the very Words of their Petition.

Answer 1. Supposing, but not granting, 1. That Acts of Parliament were contrary to this Doctrine, yet if it be, as explain'd in this and my former Letter, agreeable to the *irrepealable Acts of Christ* and his Apostles, as I firmly believe

^m *Rights, &c. Pref. p. xxxvii.*

46 A CONTINUATION of

it is; then there is a very safe Question upon sacred Record in such a Case: *Whetherⁿ it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto Men more than unto God?* I hope, Sir, you will judge, that if the heavenly and any earthly Throne should *fundamentally* differ in their Commands: *Active Obedience* were due to God *Most High*, while you would humbly pay a *Passive Submission* to the Secular Powers, and with a great and stedfast Mind bear the Punishments inflicted by them.

2. Supposing, Sir, that, as the present Bishop of Sarum says, ^o "The Extreme of raising the Ecclesiastical Power too high in the Times of Popery, had now produc'd another, of depressing it too much:" And, Sir, supposing it to be true, as the same Bishop says, ^p That there is a Defect [of some part of godly Discipline] in our Church, which she confesses in her Office of Communion, and wishes [what is defective] may be restor'd. In view of these two Quotations I beg Leave, Sir, humbly to offer the following Queries.

Qu. I. Whether it would not be most undutiful to imagine, that our supreme Civil Governours successively, would deliberately and authoritatively command us to bemoan the *Want*,

ⁿ Acts 4. 19.

^o Bishop Burnet's History, Vol. 2. p. 49, 50. cited by the Reverend Dr. Francis Atterbury, Dean of Christ Church, and Prolocutor of the present Lower House of Convocation, in his *Rights, Powers, &c. of an English Convocation*, p. 112.

^p *A Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England*. Lond. Printed, 1707. Pref.

and with the Restoration of any part of Primitive godly Discipline, which yet they are unwilling to permit or promote, even tho' themselves from time to time join in the same *lamenting Wish*?

Qu. 2. Whether any thing that a Church has diffus'd, and wishes to be restor'd, can ever take place in what the Bishop of *Sarum* calls a depress'd State of Ecclesiastical Power?

Q. 3. Whether the Clergy in any Country ought in this suppos'd depress'd State, (but confess'd as such by the Bishop of *Sarum*) decently to represent the Matter to the Secular Powers, and most humbly entreat a Redress of the Grievance?

Qu. 4. Whether the Bishops and Clergy, as being ¹ Inspectors and Instructors of Christ's Flock, in which certainly Christian Princes are eminently included, can be ² free from their Blood, if they declare not unto them ³ the whole Counsel of God, so far as they know it?

Qu. 5. Whether it would not be a most impious Reflection upon any Christian supreme Civil Magistrate in any Country, to suppose, that being sufficiently appriz'd of the Merits of the Cause, by those who are establish'd by the Laws of God and the Land to instruct them in all Spirituals; they would continue the least depressing Encroachment on the Ecclesiastical Powers?

¹ *Acts* 20. 28.

² *Verse* 26.

³ *Verse* 27.

Qu. 6.

Qu. 6. Supposing any Secular Prince abroad, for there's no fear of it at Home, should oppose the Clergy in their humble and just Desires of enjoying the *Jure Divino* Extent of their Ecclesiastical Power, in every Branch of its purely *Spirituals*, according to the Scriptures, the Practice of the Primitive Church, and the Rules of Expediency and Reason. Whether or not the Right Reverend and Learned Bishop of *Sarum*'s Determination is fit to be follow'd? "The
 " Prelates and other Divines, *says the Bishop*,
 " that compil'd our Forms of Ordination, did it
 " by virtue of the Authority they had from
 " Christ, as Pastors of his Church, which did
 " empower them to teach the People the pure
 " word of God, and to administer the Sacra-
 " ments, and perform all other holy Functions,
 " according to the Scripture, the Practice of the
 " Primitive Church, and the Rules of Expedi-
 " ency and Reason; And this they ought to
 " have done, *says the Right Reverend Bishop of*
Sarum, tho' the Civil Power had oppos'd it: In
 " which Case, their Duty had been to have submitted
 " to whatever Severities and Persecutions they might
 " have been put to, for the Name of Christ, or the
 " Truth of his Gospel. Thus that learned Prelate.

3. This Doctrine of the Independence of the Church, in its purely *Spirituals*, upon the State;

* *Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England, &c.* by Gilbert Burnet. London Printed 1707. p. 53. 54. cited by Dr. Francis Atterbury, Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation, in his *Rights, Powers, &c. of an English Convocation, &c.* p. 195.

this

this Definition of the *Mitre* and the *Crown* is not contrary to the *Act of Supremacy*, as it has been, and still is qualify'd and explain'd by our *Kings and Queens*, and in *Convocations* call'd by them, or *Writers* authoriz'd by them.

The Right Reverend Bishop of *Sarum* excellently instructs us in this Point. " " In King

" *Henry the Eighth's* Time, says the *Bishop*,
 " the Extent of the King's Supremacy was de-
 " fin'd in the *Necessary Erudition of a Christian*
 " *Man*, that was set forth as the Standard of the
 " Doctrine of that time; and it was upon this
 " that all People were oblig'd to take their
 " Measures, and not upon some Expressions ei-
 " ther in Acts of Parliament, or Acts of the
 " Convocation, nor upon some *Stretches of the*
 " *King's Jurisdiction*. In this then it is plainly
 " said, that with Relation to the Clergy, the
 " King is to oversee them, and to cause that they
 " execute their Pastoral Office truly and faithfully,
 " and especially in those Points which by Christ
 " and his Apostles were committed to them: And
 " to this it is added, that Bishops and Priests are
 " bound to obey all the Kings Laws, not being
 " contrary to the Laws of God. So that here
 " is express'd that necessary Reserve upon their
 " Obedience, it being provided that they were
 " only bound to obey, when the Laws were not

^a *Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation*, printed 1688. cited by the Reverend Dr. George Hickes in his *Prefatory Discourse in Answer to the Rights, &c.* Edit. 3, 1711. p. clxvii, &c.

“ *contrary to the Laws of God.* The other Re-
 “ serve is also made of *all that Authority which*
 “ *was committed by Christ and his Apostles to the*
 “ *Bishops and Priests*; and we are not asham’d
 “ to own it freely, that we see no other Reserves
 “ upon our Obedience to the King, besides these:
 “ So that these being here specify’d, there was
 “ an unexceptionable Declaration made of the
 “ *Extent of the King’s Supremacy*; yet because the
 “ Term *Head of the Church*, had something in
 “ it that seem’d harsh, there was yet a more ex-
 “ press Declaration made of this Matter under
 “ Queen *Elizabeth*, of which indeed our Au-
 “ thor hath taken notice; tho’ I don’t find he
 “ takes notice of the former, which he ought
 “ to have done, if he had intended to have re-
 “ presented this Matter sincerely to the World,
 “ which I confess seems not to have troubl’d
 “ him much. The Explanation made by Queen
 “ *Elizabeth* is so express, that even our Author
 “ cannot find any Advantage against the words
 “ themselves, but acknowledgeth that they are
 “ such general Terms, that the Article it self
 “ may be subscrib’d by all Sides. Since then
 “ the declar’d Sense of those general and ex-
 “ tended Expressions that are in some Acts of
 “ Parliament, is such, that there lies no just
 “ Exception against it; and since this Sense was
 “ not only given by Queen *Elizabeth*, who al-
 “ low’d such as took the Oath to declare, that
 “ they took it *in that sense*; but it was after-
 “ ward enacted both in Convocation and in Par-
 “ liament, and put into the Body of our Con-
 “ fession

“ fession of Faith ; *this Explanation must be*
 “ consider’d as *the true Measure of the King’s*
 “ *Supremacy* ; and the wide Expressions of the
 “ former Laws must be understood to be re-
 “ strain’d by this, since *posterior Laws derogate*
 “ *from those that were at first made.* So that
 “ according to all this, the King’s Supremacy
 “ doth not give to our Princes the ministring ei-
 “ ther of God’s Word, or of the Sacraments —
 “ But that only Prerogative, which we see to
 “ have been given always to all godly Princes in
 “ holy Scriptures by God himself ; that is, that
 “ they should rule all Estates and Degrees commit-
 “ ted to their Charge by God, whether they be
 “ Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with
 “ the Civil Sword the stubborn and the Evil-doers.
 “ This is all that Supremacy, says his Lordship,
 “ which we are bound in Conscience to own ;
 “ and if the Letter of the Law, or the Stretches
 “ of that in the Administration of it, have car-
 “ ried this farther, we are not at all concern’d
 “ in it : But in case any such thing were made
 “ out, it could amount to no more than this ;
 “ that the Civil Power had made some Encroach-
 “ ments on Ecclesiastical Authority ; but the sub-
 “ mitting to an Oppression, and the bearing it till
 “ some better Times may deliver us from it, is no
 “ Argument against our Church : On the contra-
 “ ry, it is a Proof of our Temper and Patience,
 “ and of that Respect we pay to that Civil Au-
 “ thority which God hath set over us, even
 “ when we think that it passeth its Bounds.

“ So that, upon the whole Matter, if the
 “ great and unmeasur'd Extent of the Papal Au-
 “ thority, made our Princes judge it necessary
 “ to secure themselves from those Invasions, *by*
 “ *stretching their Jurisdiction* a little too much;
 “ on the other Hand, those who have submit-
 “ ted so tamely to the one, have no Reason to
 “ reproach us for bearing the other Servitude,
 “ even supposing that we granted that to be the
 “ Case: And if in the time of our Reformation,
 “ some of our Bishops or other Writers, have
 “ carried the *Royal Supremacy too far*, either in
 “ Acts of Convocation, or in their Writings; as
 “ those things are personal Matters, in which
 “ we are not at all concern'd, who do not pre-
 “ tend to assert an Infallibility in our Church,
 “ so their Excess in this was a thing so natural,
 “ that we have all possible Reason to excuse it,
 “ or at least to censure it very gently. For as
 “ all Parties and Persons are carried by a Byass
 “ very common to Mankind, to magnify that
 “ Authority which favours and supports them;
 “ so the Extremes of the Papal Tyranny, and
 “ the Ecclesiastical Power that had formerly
 “ prevail'd, might have carried them too far
 “ into the opposite Extreme, *of raising the Civil*
 “ *Power too high.*

Upon which he argues two things. 1. “ The
 “ Clergy's binding themselves never to make any
 “ Decisions in Matters of Faith or Worship, till
 “ they had first obtain'd the Consent of the
 “ Secular Governour. 2. The Clergy's authori-
 “ zing the Secular Governour, or those whom he
 “ should

" should nominate, to determine those Matters in
" their stead.

" It is certain, no Clergy in the World can
" make any such Deputation; and if any have
" done it, it was a personal Act of theirs, which
" was null of it self, and did not indeed bind
" those who made it, it being of its own Na-
" ture unlawful, much less can it bind their
" Successors.

Thus, Sir, do's this learned Casuist and Pre-
late, so particularly skill'd in the History of our
Reformation, defend the Doctrine in hand a-
gainst the invidious Attempts of all those who
destitute of true Argument, would be battering
it and its Votaries with the Statutes of *Henry*
the Eighth, and the Submission of the Clergy
then. It is most evident then, Sir, that in the
Days of that King, and afterwards, the *Regal*
Supremacy was explain'd into such a sound equi-
table Sense, as is consistent with the spiritual
Rights of Bishops and Priests; and that Expla-
nation was enacted both in Convocation and in
Parliament, and put into the Body of our
* Confession of Faith: And as so explain'd, it
imports no more than what is most readily own'd
in my stating the Question in the first Letter,
and so leaves the Church in free Possession of
her Spiritual Powers.

And whereas the *Author of the Rights* says,
that the *Regal Supremacy* was enacted at the
Request of the Clergy. It is a gross Mistake:

* Thirty seventh Article of the Church of England.

54 A CONTINUATION of

For as a Reverend and Learned Divine tells us,
 “ y The Clergy was then under great Terror, —
 “ a *Premunire* hung over them, when they made
 “ their Submission, which was about two Years
 “ before it was enacted by Parliament ; — they
 “ were drawn into a Compliance with great Diffi-
 “ culty ; and threatening Messages were sent them
 “ by the King before they could be brought to it. —
 “ There is scarce any one thing done in any of
 “ Henry the Eighth's Convocations, of which
 “ we have a clearer and fuller Account, than of
 “ the Opposition which the Court-Form of Sub-
 “ mission met with from the Clergy, before they
 “ came up to it.” But supposing the Clergy
 had submitted without Struggle, I ask, Sir,
 whether they could aliente from themselves or
 their Successors, those spiritual Powers where-
 with Christ had peculiarly vested them ? Are
 positive Divine Institutions alterable either by
 the *Mitre* or the *Crown*, or both ? “ If Bishops,
 “ says the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, ^a will not
 “ exercise that Power which Christ has given
 “ them, they are accountable to their Lord for
 “ it : But they cannot give it away, neither
 “ from themselves, nor from their Successors,
 “ for 'tis theirs only to use, not to part with it :
 “ And therefore, says he, every Bishop may re-

^a The Rights, Powers and Privileges of an English Convoca-
 tion, &c. By the Reverend Dr. Francis Atterbury Dean of Christ's
 Church, and Prolocutor of the Convocation. London Printed 1700.
 p. 92, 93. Marg. Vid. the whole third Chapter.

^a Summary of the Controversies between the Church of England
 and the Church of Rome, cited in the Case of the Regale and Poni-
 ficate, &c. Edit. 2. 1702. Pref. p. 32, 33.

“ assume

“ assume such Rights, tho’ a General Council
 “ should give them away, because *the Grant is*
 “ *void in it self.*” Thus do’s this *Reverend Dean*,
 in very plain *English*, teach the Successors of
those Bishops, how to comment upon *their invol-*
untary Act of Submission, and puts them in mind
 to stand upon the original Rights of the Clergy,
 to recover [*in a decent, orderly and peaceable*
way] their inherent Spiritual Powers, rather
 than to confirm any Encroachments upon them.

If, Sir, the *Author of the Rights*, &c. will
 still call this spiritual Independence of the Cler-
 gy, a Violation of the Regal Supremacy, and
 play the 25 *Henry VIII. c. 19.* against it without
 Intermission: I would pray him to consider,
 that all this Severity will recoil upon *himself*
 and *his Darling People*, with a redoubl’d Force:
 And how *pointed* must those Arrows be that
 pierce the *Self-condemn’d*. Do’s not this Gen-
 tleman say, that ^a “ as to these [religious]
 “ Matters, Men are still in a State of Nature,
 “ without any Sovereign Representative to de-
 “ termine for them, what they shall believe and
 “ profess. — That ’tis a grand Mistake to sup-
 “ pose the Magistrate’s Power extends to *indif-*
 “ *ferent things.* ^b That he [the Magistrate] is
 “ as much oblig’d to protect them in the way
 “ *they chuse of worshipping God, as in any other*
 “ *indifferent Matter!* ^c That he should *treat all*
 “ *his Subjects alike*, how much soever they dif-
 “ fer from him, or one another in these Mat-

^a *Rights of the Christian Church*, &c. Edit. 2. p. 15.

^b *Ibid.* p. 16.

^c *Ibid.* p. 17.

ters. And do's not he tell us that ^d the contrary Method — forces Men [themselves] to defend by *Arms* those *Natural Rights*, of which no humane Power can have a Right to deprive them. ^e That neither *Prince* nor *Priest* has any more Power over the *Peasant* [in Matters of Religion] than *he* has over either of them. Thus the *Author of the Rights*. So that if our Laws have a *Lash* in Readiness for such as claim an Independence in Spirituals upon the State (as I believe they have not) then woe to that *Gentleman* and his *Peasants*, who must have double Stripes; because they assume that Independence to themselves, and all Hereticks whatsoever, which they deny to the Clergy, and threaten those Princes with *Arms* who will refuse it them: Which I am sure comes within the Lash of the Law.

Upon the whole, Sir, ^f “ the Royal Supremacy, as the Reverend Dr. *George Hickes* observes, must fall down before this Author's *Natural Right*, as *Dagon* did before the *Ark*; because in Matters of Religion, and the Administration of it, the Magistrate hath no more Power over the meanest *Peasant*, than the meanest *Peasant* hath over him. The 25 H. 8. c. 19. can be no Bar to this *Natural Right* of the *whole Body*, tho' he ^g cites it as a *Bar* to the *Divine Right*, which the *Clergy* claim.

^d *Rights of the Christian Church*, p. 17.

^e *Ibid.* p. 24.

^f *Prefatory Discourse in Answer to the Rights*, &c. Edit. 3. 1711.

p. cxli.

^g *Rights*, &c. Pref. p. vii.

“ The whole Body will have a Power of Eccle-
 “ siastical Legislature, be they few, or be they
 “ many, be they the *National*, or be they not
 “ the *National Church*, independent on our
 “ Kings and Queens in or out of Parliament;
 “ and they must be protected in their Worship,
 “ their Articles, their Rites and Ceremonies;
 “ or else their natural Rights would authorize
 “ them, could they believe it, to call the Ma-
 “ gistrate to Account for Breach of Trust, which
 “ they repos’d in him.” I pray, *Sir*, which of
 the two is most eligible, that secular Potentates
 should confirm the spiritual Independence of the
 Clergy, who heartily disclaim all Resistance up-
 on any Pretence or Cause whatsoever; or that
 they should grant an unbounded Independence
 to the *Author of the Rights* and *his People*, how-
 soever poison’d with the most destructive Errors
 on this side of Atheism, when, in the mean time,
 he challenges them to a *Field of Blood* in case
 of Refusal? There is another popular Fallacy
 which now occurs, and ought not to be omitted.

Objection. ^h “ What a Folly and Madness is
 “ it, says the *Author of the Rights*, &c. to take
 “ the Clergy’s Word in things relating to their
 “ own Power and Jurisdiction; and suffer ’em
 “ to judge in their own Cause, and decide where
 “ their own Interest is concern’d, as they must,
 “ if they are Judges in Matters of Religion?
 “ Then to be sure, their own independent Pow-
 “ er shall be a fundamental Article.

^h *Rights of the Christian Church*, &c. Edit. 2. p. 192.

58 A CONTINUATION of

Answer 1. As to the Interest of the Clergy, I need only to call to mind what a *learned and devout Author* says upon this Head. That worthy Gentleman puts the Question thus. ⁱ“ But “ *since the Interest of the Clergy is supported by* “ *what they plead for, do's not this make it rea-* “ *sonable to suspect, that all reveal'd Religion is* “ *only Priestcraft?* And he gives full Satisfaction to it in the following *Answer*. “ *It is very fit,* “ *that they who quit all other Methods of procu-* “ *ring of Subsistence, should live of that Gospel* “ *they preach;* and tho' Men may be swayed by “ Interest, yet the Truth and Falshood of things “ no ways depend upon it; and the Measures “ of judging concerning them are quite of ano- “ ther Nature. *It is sufficient Evidence* must “ convince a Man that is impartial, concerning “ the Truth of what is asserted; and it is rea- “ sonable to suppose that they who make it their “ Business to search into these Matters, should “ be best acquainted with the Grounds of Con- “ viction. And we find that our Value for the “ *Laws of the Land* and the *Art of Physick*, is “ no ways abated by the great Advantages they “ make, who follow either of those Professions.

2. Would the *Author of the Rights, &c.* have every one to judge for themselves with respect to the Point in hand, and all other religious Matters, as he tells us that ^k “ None can make “ over the Right of judging for himself. ⁱ That

ⁱ Mr. Nelson's *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England, &c.* Edit. 5. London Printed 1708. p. 595.

^k *Rights, &c.* p. 14.

ⁱ *Ibid.* p. 24.

“ every

“ every one must judge for himself of the Forms
 “ and Modes of Worship, the *Doctrines*, Rites
 “ and Ceremonies of any Church, not only be-
 “ fore he joins himself to it, but afterwards? I pray, Sir, if there be not *most accurate Explan-
 cation and Distinction* in this Case, which our
Author has tak’n no Care of, would it not follow
 from hence, that *Heresy* and *Schism* are but mere
Scare-crows, seeing no body is oblig’d to agree
 with any one but himself? That the Unity of
 the Church, for which ^m our Saviour pray’d so
 earnestly, is contrary to Religion? That *Korah*
 and his Company died glorious Martyrs? For
 they sincerely follow’d their best Judgment.
 That there may be as many Religions as there
 are private Men? That there is no fixt Standard
 or Measure of Truth and Falshood, of Good
 and Evil? That the Christian Ministry and
 Priesthood is useless and insignificant? That
 Turks and Infidels are as much in the Right as
 Christians? For according to their best Judg-
 ment, theirs is the true Religion. I would not,
 Sir, be misunderstood, as if I were making an
 Offer to take away *Private Judgment* in Matters
 of Religion, wholly; that’s impossible to be
 done: For he that thus denies it, ⁿ do’s in the
 very same Instant confess to it, for-as-much as
 his Denial of it is an Act of his Judgment.
 ’Tis only the *wild unconfin’d Private Judg-
 ment* of this Author, who will admit no
 Rule, who would strike out of our Bible,

^m St. John 17. 21, 22, 23.

ⁿ Quod negat in actu signato, affirmat in actu exercito.

60 A CONTINUATION of

HEAR THE CHURCH, who is for giving every one a Power, either to interpret Scripture, or quite to deny it, and annul the Decrees of the Church, that I impugn; allowing in the mean time the utmost Extent of Authority to Private Judgment, that is consistent with lawful publick Authority.

3. The Sacerdotal Potentates pretend not in this Case of Spiritual Independence, or any other, to be *sole Judges* for themselves. The *Author of the Rights* cannot but know, that they submit to the Scriptures, to the Judgment of the Universal Primitive Church, the best Expositors of the Scriptures, to the Testimonies of all Antiquity, even after the Emperors were converted, as concurring in this Point of the spiritual Independence of the Church upon the State. It cannot be denied, that the Apostles knew our Lord's Mind, and the true Meaning of the Commission he gave them; and it must be allow'd, that the first Fathers of the Church knew the Mind and Meaning of the Apostles in this Point, better than our modern Adversaries; as he that follows a Man close at the Heels knows his Pace better, than one that is some Furlongs off. And this Doctrine, as is clear from Church Records and History, has been deriv'd from the Fathers of the first, to the Fathers of the second Age; from those of the second, to those of the third; and so from Age to Age, to this very Day, by the undoubted Successors of their known Predecessors.

If, Sir, after all, any should deny a real Distinction between the Sacerdotal and Regal Powers, and chuse rather *totally* to subject the *pure Spiritualities*, of the *Mitre* to the *Crown*; I am afraid they have *bidden Motives* and *secret Designs* that are *out of the Reach of Argument*. However it be, I have a few *Queries* for them to answer, before I conclude.

Qu. 1. Whether Kings can sincerely think, that those Bishops believe themselves honour'd with a divine Spiritual Commission, who lay down that Commission at their Prince's Feet, entirely subjecting it to the Crown?

Qu. 2. Whether to teach Kings or Queens, that they are not, and ought not to be subject to Bishops, in purely Spiritual Affairs, be not at the same time to teach them, that they are *quite out of the Church*, and ought to continue so? Whether Kings have any Reason to thank those who teach such Doctrine, as excludes them from the Household of Faith?

Qu. 3. Upon the Denial of the Church and State being *two formally distinct Societies*, and supposing them to be *only one Society*; all Spiritual Persons, *as such*, as well as Temporal, depending upon the King or Queen, and ° “ all “ Spiritual Power, as the *Author of the Rights, &c.* “ says, being vested in the King; and whatever “ the Bishops or other Ecclesiasticks have, being, as *he says*, deriv'd from the King: Whether it will not follow, that all the Subjects

of the State are also Subjects of the Church? And consequently, that there can be no such thing as *Actual Church-Schism*, or Rebellion against the Bishop, the Principle of *Church-Unity*; unless there be also *Actual State-Schism*, or Rebellion against the King or Queen, the Principle of *State-Unity*? But this is false in Fact; for our Dissenters that don't actually rebell against the Queen, are yet justly reckon'd Schismatics, or Rebels against the Spiritual Potentates the Bishops.

Q. 4. Whether asserting the Dependence of the Church in its *purely Spirituals* upon the State, as the *Author of the Rights*, &c. do's, be not melting the Church down into the State, and publickly owning her to be *at the absolute Mercy of the Crown*? Whether it be not complimenting away the Liberties which Christ has given to his Church, and which even *Magna Charta* authorizes her to keep? Whether it be not to teach Kings to degrade Bishops into mere Cyphers, whenever they think fit? Whether this Doctrine had any Influence upon abolishing of Episcopacy in *Scotland*? And whether it makes it not impossible for the *Universal Episcopal Church* to subsist as a *Spiritual Society*, if the Kings of the Earth should be pleas'd to persecute her thorowly?

Qu. 5. Whether to teach that the *Universal Church* is not able to subsist under a Persecution, be not as *Fundamental an Error*, as the denying any one Article of the Christian Faith?

I have

the MITRE and the CROWN. 63

I have done, *Sir*, when I have told you, that if any thing here offer'd needs farther Explication, which, for Brevity's sake, is omitted, I refer my self to the *Primitive Church* after *Constantine* the Great's Time, as well as before; and to the consentient Canons, Articles, Liturgy and other publick Records of the *Church of England*: And am, with a profound Submission and Respect,

REVEREND SIR,

Your most Humble Servant, &c.

March 27, 1712:

F I N I S.

the Mirror and the Crown.
I have done, Sir, when I have told you that
if any thing here offered needs further Examination,
on, which, for Brevity's sake, is omitted, I refer
my self to the Primitive Church after Constantine
the Great's Time, as well as before; and to the
conscientious Canons, Articles, Liturgy and o-
ther publick Records of the Church of England.
And so, with a second Substitution and
Respect,

REVEREND SIR,

Your most Humble Servant, &c.

6/6

March 27 1710.

ERRATA.

P Ag. 7 l. 5. dele the first and P. 18. l. 4. Bottom Marg. for 1688.
read 1708. P. 41. l. 8. for such read any. P. 42. l. 1. read
Qu. 5. l. 7. read Qu. 6.

F I N I S

li
io
m
u
a
h
A
R

688.
read